

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of September 26, 2007 was received and carefully reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for his review and consideration of this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1, 3-14 and 16-22 are pending in the instant application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10 and 14 have been amended to recite features to which Applicants are entitled. Thus, claims 1, 3-14 and 16-22 remain pending, of which claims 1, 10 and 14 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12, 14, 16-19, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,401 to Loudermilk et al. (Loudermilk) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,103,552 to Cornwell (Cornwell), U.S. Patent No. 5,574,519 to Manico et al. (Manico) and U.S. Patent No. 6,446,376 to Chan (Chan) and claims 7, 11, 13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Loudermilk, Cornwell, Manico and Chan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,954,514 to Haas et al. (Haas). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With respect to independent claims 1, 10 and 14, the Examiner asserts that Loudermilk, taken in combination with Cornwell, Manico and Chan, makes obvious the claimed invention. On pages 3 to 4 of the Office Action, Applicants note the Examiner admits that Loudermilk/Cornwell lack the features of one or more frame selection buttons wherein activation of one of the one or more frame selection buttons displays one or more of the interior images by moving one of the one or more frames out of the image display housing by linear non-pivotal movement, as claimed. Further, the Examiner asserts that Manico teaches such features (see Figs. 1, 2 and 7; col. 6, lines 26-32 of Manico). However, Applicants contend that Manico only teaches manually inserting and removing a cartridge (50) in order to display interior images within the housing (20) (see col. 3, lines 40-53 of Manico) and mechanically arranging prints/images by incrementing within the cartridge (see

col. 4, lines 7-13 of Manico). Thus, Manico lacks any teaching or suggestion of **mechanically positioning one of the one or more frames out of the image display housing**, as presently claimed. That is, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10 and 14 to recite, *inter alia*, the features of “one or more frame selection buttons wherein activation of one of the one or more frame selection buttons displays one or more of the interior images by mechanically positioning one of the one or more frames out of the image display housing by linear non-pivotal movement.” (See page 7, first paragraph of specification).

At the very least, the combined references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 10 and 14, as presently claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Loudermilk, Cornwell, Manico, and Chan, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the features of one or more frame selection buttons wherein activation of one of the one or more frame selection buttons displays one or more of the interior images by mechanically positioning one of the one or more frames out of the image display housing by linear non-pivotal movement, as presently claimed. Thus, it cannot be said that Loudermilk, taken alone or in any proper combination with Cornwell, Manico and Chan, makes obvious the present invention, as claimed.

Further, Haas does not overcome the deficiencies of Loudermilk, taken in combination with Cornwell, Manico and Chan, as mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10 and 14 are allowable as discussed previously. Further, any claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claims 3-9, 11-13 and 16-22 likewise be removed.

The remaining dependent claims are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination, on their on merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to their independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1, 3-14 and 16-22 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the

instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. # 48103/  
Sean A. Pryor

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128  
(202) 585-8000